UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/537,788 | 06/06/2005 | Koichi Sato | 03500.018152. | 6628 |
| 5514 7590 08/19/2008 FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA NEW YORK NY 10112 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | MARTIN, LAURA E | |
| NEW YORK, NY 10112 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2853 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 08/19/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--|--|
| | 10/537,788 | SATO ET AL. |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | LAURA E. MARTIN | 2853 |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply | pears on the cover sheet with the c | correspondence address |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE | N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). |
| Status | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 № 2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) This 3) Since this application is in condition for allowed closed in accordance with the practice under the condition of the co | s action is non-final. ance except for formal matters, pro | |
| Disposition of Claims | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 12 and 14-22 is/are pending in the all 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 12 and 14-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o | awn from consideration. | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examina 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed as a composition and accomposition and accomposition in the second area of the second as a composition in the second area of the second area. | cepted or b) objected to by the lead rawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is objection | e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). |
| | xammer. Note the attached Office | Action of form F 10-132. |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list | nts have been received. Its have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | ion No ed in this National Stage |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other: | ate |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/22/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12 and 14-16 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al. (US 2003/0070581 A1) in view of Takizawa et al. (US 5990227 A).

Tomioka et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 12: two liquid compositions each comprising a functional substance [0112]-[0113] and [0159]-[0160]; a liquid medium with a pH and a pKa of an organic acid or a salt of an organic acid of the first liquid composition being different from a pH and a pKa of an organic acid group or salt of an organic acid group of the second liquid

compostion [0139] and [0191] wherein the first liquid composition is greater than the second liquid composition in pH [0154] and [0106] of the liquid compositions, the first liquid composition is greater than the second liquid composition in pKa of the organic acid group[0191] or the salt of the organic acid, the organic acid of the second liquid composition is a sulfonic acid [0139], and an increase in viscosity of the first liquid composition is caused by a decrease in pH of the first liquid composition on contact with the second liquid composition [0138].

As per claim 14: the difference between the pKa of the organic acid groups or the salts of the organic acid group of the first and second liquid compositions is 0.3 or more, and a difference between the pH of the first and second liquid compositions is 0.3 or more [0139] and [0191].

As per claim 15: the difference between the pKa of the organic acid groups or the salts of the organic acid groups contained is at least two (acrylic acid and sulfonic acid) [0191] and [0139].

As per claim 16: the pKa of the sulfonic acid is at least two (applicant discloses the pKa of sulfonic acid in the specification being 2).

As per claim 22: the pKa of the sulfonic acid of the second liquid is not higher than 0 [0145] (less than 5).

Tomioka et al. do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 12: an amphiphilic block copolymer and the organic acid being a group of the copolymer.

As per claim 18: the amphiphilic block copolymer has an alkenyl ether as a repeating monomer unit.

As per claim 20: the functional substance is a colorant.

As per claim 21: an apparatus for liquid application, comprising a liquid applying means for applying the liquid and a driving means for driving the liquid applying means.

Takizawa et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 12: an amphiphilic block copolymer and the organic acid being a group of the copolymer (styrene-acrylic acid and methylvinylether-monoethyl maleate column 30, line 47 – column 31, line 10).

As per claim 18: the amphiphilic block copolymer has an alkenyl ether as a repeating monomer unit (methyl vinyl ether - column 30, line 47 – column 31, line 10).

As per claim 20: the functional substance is a colorant (column 30, line 47-column 31, line 10).

As per claim 21: an apparatus for liquid application, comprising a liquid applying means for applying the liquid (figure 1, element 65) and a driving means for driving the liquid applying means (figure 1, element 68).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the liquids taught by Tomioka et al. with the disclosure of Takizawa et al. in order to provide high quality image recording.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al. (US 2003/0070581 A1) and Takizawa et al. (US 5990227 A), and further in view of Nakazawa et al. (EP 1243624 A1).

Tomioka et al. as modified disclose the following the claim limitations:

As per claim 17: the method according to claim 12.

Tomioka et al. as modified do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 17: the organic acid groups are selected from benzoic acid groups, aliphatic dicarboxylic acid groups, aromatic dicarboxylic acid groups, halogen-substituted benzoic acid groups, and sulfonic acid groups.

Nakazawa et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 17: the organic acid groups are selected from benzoic acid groups, aliphatic dicarboxylic acid groups, aromatic dicarboxylic acid groups, halogen-substituted benzoic acid groups, and sulfonic acid groups [0016]-[0017].

Nakazawa et al. also discloses the amphiphilic block copolymer has an alkenyl ether as a repeating monomer unit [0016]-[0017].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by Tomioka et al. as modified with the disclosure of Nakazawa et al. to provide superior dispersion stability.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tomioka et al. (US 2003/0070581 A1) and Takizawa et al. (US 5990227 A), and further in view of Mishina et al. (US 6511534 B1).

Tomioka et al. as modified disclose the following the claim limitations:

As per claim 19: the method according to claim 12 and an amphiphilic block copolymer (column 30, line 47—column 31, line 10).

Tomioka et al. as modified do not disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 19: the functional substance is enclosed by a polymer.

Mishina et al. disclose the following claim limitations:

As per claim 19: the functional substance is enclosed by a polymer (column 16, lines 35-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method taught by Tomioka et al. as modified with the disclosure of Mishina et al. in order to provide strong fixing properties on a plurality of print medium surfaces.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 12-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LAURA E. MARTIN whose telephone number is (571)272-2160. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

Art Unit: 2853

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen D. Meier can be reached on (571) 272-2149. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Laura E. Martin

/L. E. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 2853

/Manish S. Shah/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2853